

Butler, Jennie C

From: chinook@n-gate.com
Sent: Friday, April 09, 1999 11:40 PM
To: FDADockets@test.oc.fda.gov
Subject: Docket #98N-1038

(1) Does the current radiation disclosure statement convey meaningful information to consumers in a truthful and nonmisleading manner?

Yes.

(2) How do consumers perceive the current radiation disclosure statement -- as informational, as a warning, or as something else?

Informational

(3) Does the wording of the current radiation disclosure statement cause "inappropriate anxiety" among consumers? What are examples of "inappropriate anxiety"?

The current statement offers the consumer the option of making a conscious decision. Removing the statement cancels that option.

(4) What specific alternate wording for a radiation disclosure statement would convey meaningful information to consumers, in a truthful and nonmisleading manner, and in a more accurate or less threatening way than the current wording?

What's wrong with "Treated by irradiation?" Factual. Direct.

(5) Would consumers be misled by the absence of a radiation disclosure statement in the labeling of irradiated foods? Are consumers misled by the presence of such a statement?

Again, the presence of the statement leaves the consumer an option. Its absence would be misleading and unfair.

(6) With respect to foods containing irradiated ingredients, are consumers misled by the absence of a radiation disclosure statement? Would consumers be misled by the presence of such a statement?

See #5.

(7) What is the level of direct consumer experience with irradiated foods that are labeled as such?

I fail to understand the question and the need for it.

(8) What is the effect of the current required labeling on the use of irradiation? Does the current required labeling discourage the use of irradiation?

Possibly. Let the vendors raise public awareness about the benefits of irradiation. When the public is convinced the goods are safe, the goods will sell.

(9) What do consumers understand to be the effect of irradiation on food? For example, what do consumers understand about the effect of irradiation on the numbers of harmful microorganisms in or on

98N-1038

C 558

food?

I can't speak for all consumers.

(10) Do consumers readily recognize the radura logo?

Yes.

(11) Do consumers understand the logo to mean that a food has been irradiated?

Yes.

(12) Do consumers perceive the radura logo as informational, as a warning, or as something else?

Informational.

(13) Should any requirement for a radiation disclosure statement expire at a specified date in the future?

No.

(14) If so, on what criteria should the expiration be based?

Humans have become immune to radiation.

(15) If the expiration of labeling requirements for irradiated foods is to be based on consumer familiarity with the radura logo and understanding of its meaning, what evidence of familiarity and understanding would be sufficient to allow these requirements to expire?

Vote by referendum.